

REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENTS

The above amendments have been made in an effort to more clearly define the present invention and to respond to issues raised in the rejection.

Claim 12 had been objected to because of the relative position of the formulae and their reference (with the requested word “above” replacing the erroneous word “below” in the claim). The definition of “m” has also been limited to “the integer 1” to exclude a recitation including $m = 2$, as requested by the Examiner.

REMARKS CONCERNING THE REJECTIONS

The above amendment has been made to more clearly define the present invention and to respond to issues raised in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance. All claims now depend from an allowable claim, and all claims should be allowed.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Mark A. Litman at (952) 832-9090.

Respectfully submitted,

XUZHI QIN

By His Representatives,

MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
York Business Center, Suite 205
3209 West 76th Street
Edina, Minnesota 55435
(952) 832-9090

Date: 20 April 2004

By: 

Mark A. Litman
Reg. No. 26,390